Supreme Court, U.S.
FILED

001366 MAR 1 - 2001

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

DOCKET NO.

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

TERM: 4, OCTOBER 2000 to 2001.

ON WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE EIGHTH CIRCUIT

Jeffrey Alan Olson Plaintiff vs. David M. Duffy (Judge), Diana S. Eagon (Judge), William R. Howard (Judge), Marybeth Dorn (Referee), Mary Catherine Lauhead (guardian ad litem), Kisson, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner Ltd. Defendents	**PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI** (Brief)

Jeffrey Alan Olson, pro se, 380 Bert Street, P.O. Box 536, Lake Crystal, Minnesota, 56055 Phone (507) 726-6744 for Plaintiff.
Peter M. Ackerburg, Assistant Attorney General, SOLICITOR GENERAL SECTION Suite 1100 445 Minnesota Street, St. Paul, Minnesota, 55101-2128. (612) 282-5700 for Defendant Judge and guardian ad litem.
Gerald O. Williams Jr., Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner, Edina, Minnesota, 3205 West 76th Street, Edina, Minnesota 55435 Phone (612) 896 1099. for Defendant Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner, Ltd.

The Plaintiff is arguing that his Constitutional rights have been violated; the Plaintiff is asking this Court to consider the following questions, and for the protection of such rights.

I am asking the following questions not only as a citizen but also as a Marine sworn to uphold the United States Constitution.

1. Should a United States District Judge or Appellant Judge be appointed by a jury of judges when a bench has not been filled for political reasons after Ninety days? If so what should be the criteria?

2. Should the United States Supreme Court justices, be appointed to the benchs by the United States Supreme Court, to seperate the court from politic's?

3. Is the (3) felony conviction law Constitutional? When it takes away the right to a trial by judge or jury and your sentence to life is predetermined not by the judicial branch after a trial, but by Congressional law?. If it is found to be unconstitutional, how should the convicted be waivered?

4. Should a Judge be held to account for damages to a party when the judge violates his Constitutional rights; and which results in the loss of a career?

5. Should opposing party and their attorney be held to account for damages to a party when jurisdiction was not properly obtained, which resulted in the loss of the other parties career?

6. Should a judge have lawful power to deny the right to the Soldiers and Sailors Act, to not adjust the court calender for military commitments out of the person's control?

7. Should custody of children be broken down into six year segments; which both promote the opportunity to be the primary caregiver as well as afford the

opportunity for career and allow for college and vocational training?

8. Are lawfirms taking away from the ethical act of equality or even the right to a fair trial; when the other party is pro se in a civil case?

9. Are the ethical boundries achieved when a judge can return to practicing as an attorney and the two clearly different responsibilities are never given true ethical seperation?

10. Should there be an organized set time limit for each case based on its crime or civil matter of law, which better organizes and allows for equal court time by all people? Should this responsibility be governed by the Supreme Court of the United States and reaffirmed every five years?

11. Should a judge be allowed the right to remove a witness if the line of questioning is out of line or not applicable to the case after ten questions?

12. Should a judge be allowed to ask at least five questions to defend or in favor of the defendant; and five questions to convict or in favor of the plaintiff, after the jury cannot come to a decision after three hours and there after be known as the ten questions of doubt?

13. Should a defendant be allowed the right to take the stand and have the ten questions of doubt applied toward their appeal after a verdict of guilty?

14. Should the defendant lose his or her right to an appeal if they chose not to take the stand and face the ten questions of doubt, and be ordered to pay the debt, or face death, if the death penalty is so awarded without lost time or humiliation?

15. Define the reasoning behind or against adding judges to the Supreme Court of the United States?

16. Should rules be put into a hand out for all persons acting pro se, to effectively tell them the proceedures and rules (like the one made available by this court) in state court's?

17. Should state law library's be opened to the public if state or federally funded, and have signes posted where they are to be located at in the court filing window?

18. Please define visitation right's? Please clearly define the responsibilities and penalties against a judge for denying these rights for unlawfull reasons?

19. Can the Guardian Ad Litem be held for damages when they refuse to apply the rules for visitation without lawful order?

20. Should the allowable time to sue be extended longer than its current state of limitations?

21. Should attorney's fees be awarded to a parties attorney, who has not achieved jurisdiction in good faith?

22. If opposing party is seeking attorney's fees, should a monthly statement be sent to that party notifying them of the current total for attorney's fees?

23. Should a United States Judge Marshall's Office be established to protect citizens rights?

24. Should children be added to the parent's state drivers licenses for accountability?

25. Should hotels and motels house abused parent's upon filing of domestic assault charges, where the perpetrator cannot be found?

LIST OF THE PARTIES:

Plaintiff:

1. Jeffrey Alan Olson

Defendents:

1. David M. Duffy (Judge),
2. Diana S. Eagon (Judge),

3. William R. Howard (Judge),
4. Marybeth Dorn (Referee),
5. Mary Catherine Lauhead (Guardian Ad-litem),
6. Kissoon, Clugg, Linder & Dittberner

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

	Page
Cover	i
Questions	ii
List Of Parties	iv
Table of Contents	v
Citations	v
Basis of Jurisdiction	v
Constitutional Provisions	vi
Consise Statement	Vi
Direct and Consise Argument	1
Claim for Damages	6a
Appendedex	1

(d) Citations of The Official and Unofficial Reports of the Opinions and Orders:

(1) 3-11-96, Dorn, Hearing, Hennepin
(2) 9-13-96, Dorn, Hearing, Hennepin
(3) 2-26-97, Dorn, Hearing, Hennepin.
(4) 5-1-97, Duffy, Hearing, Hennepin.
(5) 7-28-97, Duffy, Trial, Hennepin.
(6) 7-29-98, Duffy, Hearing, Hennepin.
(7) 2-2-99, Kyle, Order, U.S. Dist.
(8) 4-15-99, Kyle, Order, U.S. Dist
(9) 2-16-00, Magnunson, Order U.S.Dist.
(10) 5-10-00, Magnunson, Order U.S. Dist.
(11) 7-27-00, Magnunson, Order U.S. Dist.
(12) 12-7-00, BEAM, FAGG, & LOKEN U.S.AP.
(13) 1-26-01, Direction Court U.S. APP.

(e) STATEMENT OF THE BASIS FOR JURISDICTION IN THIS COURT IS AS FOLLOWS:

(i) This is on direct appeal from a United States district court and is authorized by law for matters in question of the United States Constitution.

(ii) Plaintiff will serve defendants via county sheriffs department.

(iii) The statutory provision which confers on this court jurisdiction are as follows: 28 U.S.C. & 1254, & 2403.

AS 42 U.S.C. 1983 for violations of the Fifth Amendment, Sixth Amendment, Seventh Amendment, Eighth Amendment, Ninth Amendment, Tenth Amendment, Eleventh Amendment, Thirteenth Amendment, Fourteenth Amendment, and the Soldiers and Sailors Act.

Amendment V: Mr. Olson was deprived of life, liberty, and property, when Mr. Olson was forced from his career in the United States Marines, deprived of his life when he lost visitation rights to both children, and liberty when he had to move from his home in California where he chose to live. Because of the wrongful over take of jurisdiction.

Amendment VI: Mr. Olson was never charged with any criminal crime but Mr. Olson was Ordered to not see his children without a trial, without being read his rights, or having counsel assigned.

Amendment VII: Mr. Olson was told that he could not bring a suit in Minnesota, jury or otherwise by the chief judge in Hennipen County.

Amendment VIII: Mr. Olson has had unusual punishments inflicted upon him, being tortured with his visitation rights with his son and step daughter, as well as the tortures imposed by the guardian in establishing visitation rights.

Amendment IX: Mr. Olson was denied certain rights as to be a parent, and his own attorney where he was denied legal actions such as bringing witnesses, and argueing for his rights already described.

Amendment X: The Judge's violated Mr. Olson's rights under the Soldiers and Sailors Act, refusing to accomadate him under court hearings and visitation schedules. Which forced Mr. Olson from his beloved career in the United States Marine Corps.

Amendment XI: The judges in Minnesota commenced a suit where both parties were

citizens of another state and one was property of the United States, the state of Minnesota deprived the United States of its property without lawfull order or permission of the United States.

Amendment XIII: Involuntary servitude has been imposed upon Mr. Olson where Mr. Olson was forced to the state of Minnesota, Mr. Olson has been forced to pay taxes but has not been given the protections of a citizen of the state, where by law he should have been given visitation rights with his children.

Amendment XIV: Mr. Olson has been deprived of his visitation rights, career, life and liberty because the Judges have enforced judicial immunity and the Eleventh Amendment rights which allows for Mr. Olson's rights to be refused in their interpretation, violating Mr. Olson's Fourteenth Amendment Rights.

Plaintiff (Mr.Olson) also wishes to question issues which the Attorney generals office has made issue to.

Forcing Mr. Olson to the state of Minnesota out of the Military, and holding Mr. Olson's visitation rights hostage is within the courts right to question the Thirteenth Amendment for involuntary servitude.

AMENDMENT IX - (The enumeration in the Constitution, of certain rights, shall not be construed to deny or disparage others retained by the people).

Mr. Olson (Plaintiff) has asserted his right's to parent and foster a relationship with his son as well as his step-daughter. The Judges as well as the Guardian were overwhelming in there assertion of power of Mr. Olson's right's, and the deliberate action they took to crush Mr. Olson's very existence as a human being. I could not possible convey in words what this has done to my son, my step-daughter, my family, and to me.

CONSISE STATEMENT:

1. Custody: Should be reversed to the Appellant for denial of visitation of both children namely Jake Tyler Olson and Mallory Page Zamzow.

a. Griffin v. Van Griffin, 267 N.W.2d 733 (Minn.1978).

b. Clark v. Clark, 346 N.W.2d 383 (Minn. App. 1984).

c. Grein v. Grein, 364 N.W.2d 383 (Minn. 1985).

d. Hunt v. Hunt, 381 N.W.2d 467 (Minn. App. 1986).

2. Compensation for damages in loss of career in the United States Marine Corps because the Judges, the Guardian Ad Litem, and the law firm forcefully violated Mr. Olson's rights. The action's taken destroyed the parent relationship and destroyed Mr. Olson's career and life without lawful order or human dignity.

a. Norsworthy v. Norsworthy, 289 Ark. 479, 713 S.W.2d 452, 455 (1986).

b. Ashburn v. Ashburn, 661 N.E. 2d 39 (Ind. Ct. App. 1996).

c. Paulsen v. Paulsen, 129 Idaho 536, 928 P.2d 40 (1996).

d. Ex Parte Blanton, 463 So.2d 162 (Ala. 1985).

DIRECT AND CONSISE ARGUMENT:

1. The Plaintiff filed for a dissolution in the state of California after his wife at the time removed the children from the home in Twenty-Nine Palms California without Mr. Olson's knowledge on September 23, 1995.

2. The Plaintiff was a United States Marine at the time of the removal until October 1996 and was on his seventh year of honorable service.

3. A hearing was held in the municiple court in California where Mrs. Olson was Ordered to bring the children back to

California where the proceedings would continue and Mr. Olson was awarded temporary rights to see and visit the children.

4. A hearing was held in the municiple court in California and subsequently in Hennipen District Court in Minnesota.

5. The Minnesota Court argued that the children were in Minnesota and that Mr. Olson could see them freely when he returned to Minnesota to see his family and that a hearing would be held in Minnesota to decide if the Minnesota court had jurisdiction and that Mr. Olson's military service would be considered in hearing dates.

6. The Minnesota Judge set a hearing in February to decide jurisdiction, the Plaintiff sent an affidavit from his supiorer officer stating that an inspection team from head quarters is scheduled to inspect Sergent Olson's Armory and that the Dates could not be changed because this was a fleet readiness inspection for possible deployment to Iraq or Bosnia at the time.

7. The Minnesota Judge said that she would not detract from her court schedule, siding against the Soldiers and Sailors Act. Threw out the proceedings Mr. Williams would meet with the judges and was also seen coming from the chambers when ever court would resume as was Paula's sister Susan.

8. The Minnesota Court would not rule on visitation rights for the Plaintiff but had reserved them for a later time.

9. The Plaintiff returned to Minnesota in April, talked to his newly appointed attorney Mr. Albrecht and discussed visiting the children. Mr. Albrecht could see no reason or Order to stand in the way of going over and picking up the children for the weekend.

10. The Plaintiff proceeded to the

apartment complex where he was told that he should remove himself from the property and that there would be no visitation of any kind.

11. The Plaintiff proceeded back to the attorneys office and briefed his attorney on the situation.

12. The Plaintiff finally seen his son three hours before his flight on Sunday where the only Order the judge would issue was supervised visitation by his wifes family at a mall.

13. The Plaintiff returned in July to visit the children but this time Mrs. Olson's family refused to allow visits at the mall. Again Mr. Olson spent most of his time waiting in the hallway as his attorney argued for visitation rights.

14. Finally the day Mr. Olson was to leave back for California he was allowed visitation, Mrs. Olson's brother brought the child in with a smug smile on his face. He handed the child to Mr. Olson's father and left, not supervising the child and said he was going to play video games. The Plaintiff became suspicious and removed the childs jacket and cap, the child was very groggy and had two goose eggs on his head.

15. Mr. Olson went back to Mrs. Olson's brother and told him that if we did not proceed directly to the hospital he was going to call the police.

16. Mrs. Olson's brother and Mr. Olson along with Mr. Olson's father and grandfather proceeded to the hospital.

17. The child was admitted and Mr. Olson returned the child to his then brother-n-law after the doctor ok'd the release.

18. The Plaintiff then returned back to Minnesota in September and was given visitation rights at a facility for parents who abused there children because Mrs. Olson's family refused to

conduct visit's any longer at the mall. Mr. Olson was forced to leave the United States Marine Corps because he could not properly serve his country, travel back to Minnesota for court, see his children with the courts zero tolerance for considering Mr. Olson's service in arranging court and visitation schedules. With only a thirty day vacation or leave from the Marines. The staff at Perspectives degraded the father in front of the child, and did their best to provoke hostility from Mr. Olson.

19. Mrs. Olson's family then agreed once more to visitation at the mall. Visitation was going good and Mrs. Olson's family members became angry and frustrated because this was not helping their case of sole physical custody and Mrs. Olson filed motions to remove the child to Pennsylvania.

20. They then refused to supervise visitation at the mall, so it was agreed that Mr. Olson would be supervised by his family on Thanksgiving Day. The meeting place was at the Super Eight Hotel in Mankato Minnesota.

21. The child was turned over to Mr. Olson by his mothern-law and once again there were goose bumps and this time facial bruises on the child. Mr. Olson proceeded directly out of the hotel to the gas station next door. Mr. Olson phoned the police and gave a statement of complaint and child abuse entrapment to the Blue Earth and Nicollet county sheriffs department.

22. Mr. Olson returned the child after the scheduled visit, and was greeted by his mother-n-law with racial slurrs and curse words.

23. Two weeks before Christmas Mr. Olson attempted visitation with the child, the mother-n-law showed up and refused visitation because Mr. Olson had brought

his grandmother along who was part Native American and refused the transfer of the child.

24. Mr. Olson dismissed his attorney for financial reasons in February. Upon Mr. Albrecht's dismissal Mr. Olson was refused visitation or any contact by the children. Mr. Olson was Ordered to take a parenting class which he completed and served to the court to the Honorable Judge David M. Duffy.

25. Mr. Olson was then told that he must go and conduct visitation back at Perspectives. Mr. Olson was quite sure that this time Mr. Olson would be set up, and provocked and harrassed; Mr. Olson refused to go along with Perspectives because the child was being mistreated by the ladies at Perspectives. The child being only a year and a half was dragged buy one arm down the hall screaming because he wanted to stay and play with his father and grandfather. I asked the lady to stop and she said if you don't shut up I am calling the police.

26. Judge David M. Duffy was amused when I told him that I would wait to visit my son tell a better situation presented itself. Judge Duffy then Ordered me to take a psychological examination where I was treated this time as a child molester asked all these questions about sex with children and animals. After each question the doctor said are you angry Mr. Olson? During the session the doctor kept getting interrupted and went to answer the phone, I remained calm and restrained as the doctor put it. I knew the idea was to provoke me to become angry. The doctor would then return and say either Judge Duffy or Judge Eagon had an additional question.

27. The Honorable Judge David M. Duffy then refused visitation completely again and set pretrial at the next hearing.

28. The pre-trial was short, Mr. William's (Mrs. Olson's attorney) asked that Mr. Olson pay all his attorney's fees and for the psychological. Judge David M. Duffy refused to award anything at that time but said he would consider that after the trial.

29. The trial was one sided again, Mr. Olson was refused all his request's for witnesses except his family and he was reminded that all of his family members were parcial to testimony anyway and that it was a waste of the courts time. Several items were refused as evidence and taken from the transcript. Mr. Olson was asked if he was part Native American and Mr. Olson said yes. The judge then asked what Native American's eat that makes them Native American's. I begin to randomly say foods like pumpkin pie and I had to stop because the judge was not paying any attention he was talking to his assistant attorney laughing about something. He then turned back toward me and said what do you put in the beef? I never answered.

30. The Honorable Judge David M. Duffy took myself, Mr. William's and the court reporter intoo his chambers and said we will continue this in my chamber's. Judge Duffy told me there was to much evidence stacked against me that he would not allow me to see my son unless I stopped persueing litigation for my loss of career, I asked to see my son and stood by my right to persue litigation and said that I could prove that their is overwhelming prejudice against me.

31. At the conclussion of the trial I was refused visitation and told that I must take everything in front of the chief judge where it was refused on several different occasion's, for motions of visitation where the same Order was copied off the copy machine and thrown at me,

CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Plaintiff (Mr. Olson) moves this court for an Order in addition to motions filed pursuant to (1:1557) Introductory Clause-Several Claims Stated in Seperate Counts.

Plaintiff for a first count alleges:

1.1 Future loss of wages prior to retirement: beginning at $2000.00 per month for twenty-two years with increase in rank and commission ending at $4000.00 per month.

Total $2000.00 $4000.00

x 12	x 12 months
24,000.	48,000.
x 22	x 22years
$528,000.	$1,056,000.

$528,000. + $1,056,000 = $1,584,000. $1,584,000 /22 = 72000 72000/2 = $36,000.00 on average per year x 22 years =$792,000.00

1.2 Future loss of wages after retirement $36,000 x .75 = $27,000. with increases of on average of two percent every four years =$540 after first four years. Averaging with perspective after retirement at age fifty two, threw age seventy. $27,000 x 18 years = $486,000 + pay increases by average of two percent $27,000 x 2% x 2 = $1080.00 on average $27000 + $1080.00 = $28,080.00 x 18 years = $505,440.00

Total wages lost = $792,000.00 + $505,440.00 = $1,297,440.00

Plaintiff for a second account alleges:

2.1 Future Loss in family Medical full coverage prior to retirement.
Medical check-ups $559.00 annually.
Medical care $12,700.00 annually.
Medication $879.00 annually.
Total= $17,397.00 annually.
Increased medical expenses x 12% =$2087.64

extra per year.
Total with increase $17,397.00 + $2087.64 = $19,484.64
$19,484.64 x 22 years = $428,662.08

2.2 Future loss in medical full coverage after retirement.
Medical check-ups $2847.00 annually.
Medical care $37,456.00 annually.
Medication $6548.00 annually.
Total = $46,851.00
Increased medical expenses x 12% = $5622.12 extra per year. $46851.00 + 5622.12 = $52,473.00 total annually
$52,473.00 x 18 = $944,514.00
Total medical expenses $428,662.08 + $944,514.00 = $1,373,176.08
Plaintiff for a third account alleges:

3.1 Future loss in dental coverage prior to retirement.
Dental check ups $265.00 annually.
Dental care (fillings, crowns, etc.) $445.00 annually
Total $710.00
$710.00 x 5% increase in Dental expenses = $35.5
Total = $710.00 + 35.5 = $745.50
$745.50 annually x 22 years = $16,401.00

3.2 Future loss in Dental coverage after retirement. Dental check ups $489.00 annually. Dental care (surgery, replacement teeth) $2789.00 annually. Total = $3278.00 x 9% increase in dental expenses= $295.00 Total annually $3278.00 + $295.00 = $3573.00 Total $3573.00 x 18 years = $64,314.00 Plaintiff for a fourth count alleges: Attorney's fees $5,000 + $5,000 + $4000 + $1000 in legal assistant, copies ect = $15,000 in total. Punitive damages: loss of Honor, loss of parent-child relationship for almost the entire first four years of the childs life, mental stress, and humiliation. Total 50,250,069.92, Total loss in all, the Plaintiff is asking for $54,025,000.00 in damages.

to pick up in the hallway.

32. I then took my case to the federal district court of Minnesota. Where the court refused to hear the case based on prejudice.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR CHANGE IN LAW:

1. To be treated equally having equal time in court as everyone else by a standard system.

a. A system of justice which sets time limits upon the trial by catagory subject matter; such as a murder trial shall be limited to ten days or the hours contained in a ten day court hearing, (five days for the prosecution or plaintiff in civil and five days for the defense or defendants).

b. The prosecution and defense shall limit their witnesses to the most valued.

c. The United States Supreme Court shall set up the standard system of time limits.

d. This shall ensure an adequate court calender, promote equal justice, put less burden upon the court system, long drawn out trials overwhelm juries and time limits promote attentive attorney's where the burden again lies upon the attorney's to prove their case in a respectable manner, it allows for a much more consistant case to look at when it is appealed, not burdening taxpayers with unprepared cases and releasing the brakes on the wheels of justice.

2. To have a judge who is not having conflicts with judgments and Orders because they anticipate political or other reprocussions if they rule on the case, where they should be free from political implications.

a. The federal district court judges should be appointed by a three judge panel or jury of their peers.

b. The panel is to be federal appellate judges.

c. They shall have thirty days to review the applications and meet for the last day together interviewing if necessary the final three applicants selected.

d. The final selection shall be made fourteen days after the interview and the judge shall be appointed within sixety days to the bench, ready to serve the people.

3. Having a fair jury trial where more of a chance is given to convict guilty person's and setting free innocent persons wrongfully accused.

a. After a person has been found guilty by a jury a person shall have the right to be asked the ten questions of doubt to accompany the appeal.

b. The ten questions shall be direct questions asked by the judge placing the person with the crime.

4. That a office be made for investigating negligence of state judge benches, where violations of civil rights, statutes, parental rights, Constitutional rights and all other specifically adopted and put into law to protect citizens from improper rulings are enforced, where a judge knowingly violates a citizens rights and the citizen has neither the education or the monitary fees to persue application or defend themselves in a civil or criminal court with in the court system.

a. That this office falls under the United States attorney Generals office.

b. That the Judge Marshall may stop a case, and assign a new judge to a case after reviewing evidence.

c. The Judge Marshall has access to all areas of the proceedings and may sit in on all cases.

d. The Judge Marshall shall utilize a system of fines imposed upon

the state and the states judicial payroll as well as retirement depending upon the severity of the act.

e. The Judge Marshall also may pull an attorney's license to practice law and impose sanctions against the attorney, law firm, public defender, and prosecutor for violation of individual right's.

f. The Judge Marshalls office shall be available to all citizens, for statements and charges.

g. All fines will be argued in front of an agreeable arbitrator.

h. The Judge Marshall shall file with the federal court all inadequate and or questionable laws of the states which violate citizens rights, the United States Constitution, statutes, Congressional laws, and treaties which he comes into contact with or statements and charges addressing these violations.

i. The Judge Marshalls office is to be shared and staffed by civialian lawyers, United States Marine Corps lawyers, and United States Marines sworn to protect the United States Constitution and shall be utilized in times of Marshall Law.

5. Parental rights:

Having an equal chance to parent and start and or maintain a career is essential. As a society we have to overcome the differences associated with parenting and working as a set gender status for life. To break these barriors we must impose a six year custody term for each parent. It far more helps the mother start her career as well as gives the father his opportunity to be the care giver. We cannot say a female can do a job and hold down a career as well as a male and then say that a difference exists for a father to be a caregiver to a child and that is set aside for

females. You have to break this area of gender steareo typing, if true equallity is ever to be achieved!

a. Parental visitation will be established with-in sixety days from petition for dissolution or seperation.

b. Supervised Visitation: shall be warrented only when the child has been sexually abused, or physically abused, and the parent is found guilty in a criminal trial.

c. Supervised pick up and drop off points of the child: shall be warrented only when the custodial parent has been physically abused by police report, not allegation, testimony by the parent or secondary party.

d. Supervised visitation shall be maintained by the county sherriff's department.

e. Dissolution civil proceeding's shall consist of the following: 1a. Division of marital assetts and debt equally.

2a. Custodial rights to the children to be divided equally or every six years; the custody of the child is to change to the other parent (to promote equal love, maintenance, parenting, and responsibility in the eyes of the child). During the non-custodial parenting years, the non-custodial parent is to have no less than one-third of the time with the child outside of the six to seven hours the child is in school and the eight hours of sleep per day, based on the whole year.

f. No parental right's are to be severed without a criminal trial (crimes against the child).

6. That all parents be required and have added to their drivers licenses with the department of motor-vehicles a profile or description of each child in their family AS FOLLOWS:

a. full name b. height c. weight

d. color eyes e. color hair f. picture of child g. parent's of the child h. childs attending school name.

7. Parental right to shelter where the perpatrator of a violent act has fled the seen shall consist of the following: a. A parent shall upon filing domestic abuse charges with a peace officer, that peace officer shall accompany the parent and the children to a hotel or motel.

b. The officer is to instruct the hotel clerk that a victom of domestic violence and the children will be staying at the facilities for a period of four days if needed.

c. The Hotel or motel clerk is not to charge the victom or the children for the stay but shall save the receipt and deduct the fees at tax time.

d. Refusal of room will result in a ten thousand dollar fine and or one year in jail if it is found that rooms were available.

I beleive that judges, especially Supreme Court Justices, should be chosen by Judges who know what it takes to be judges and that is my opinion. By having the justices, choose future justices, it seperates the court from the political idealogies associated with political parties. I believe that having the President choose the attorney general and the Justices, does not clearly seperate the two branchs of government and lends itself to parcial, and at least sympathetic thinking. American's should not have to put their right's on the line everytime a President is elected and a Justice is replaced. American rights should never be won or lost in such a way. We must guarantee them & hold our justices with higher regard than to subject our Supreme Court to be bought and sold by favors to the President, which I find troubling.